

Appl. No. 10/001,894  
Amdr. dated February 7, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of October 6, 2004

PATENT

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claim 31 has been amended; claims 1-30 and 31-45 remain unchanged. Thus, claims 1-45 are pending.

Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite.

Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 17, 20, 23-25, 33 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mao et al. (US 6,546,385).

Claims 2-3 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao and further in view of Mohan (Text-based search of TV news stories, 1996).

Claims 5, 10, 16, 21, 26, 32, 34, 39 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao in further view of Myers et al. (A Multi-Vie Intelligent Editor for Digital Video Libraries, 24, June 2001).

Claims 6, 11, 22, 27, 35 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao in further view of Chiu et al. (Automatically Linking Multimedia Meeting Documents by Image Matching, 2000).

Claims 12, 28 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao in further view of Dimotrova et al. (Video Keyframe Extraction and Filtering: A Keyframe is not a Keyframe to Everyone, 1997).

Claims 13, 29 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao in further in view of Chen et al. (ViBE: A Video Indexing and Browsing Environment, September 1999).

Claims 14, 30 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao and Chen and further in view of Myers.

Claims 15, 31 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao.

As amended, all the pending claims of the subject application comply with all requirements of 35 U.S.C. Accordingly, Applicant requests examination and allowance of all pending claims.

**The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out the typist error in claim 31.

Claim 31 has been amended to recite "second user-selectable identifier" instead of "second user-

Appl. No. 10/001,894  
Amtd. dated February 7, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of October 6, 2004

PATENT

"selectable identifier" at the location identified by the Examiner. As amended, claim 31 overcomes the rejection under §112. The amendment to claim 31 also overcomes the rejection of claim 32, for being dependent on a rejected claim. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of both claims 31 and 32 under § 112.

**The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

**Claim 1**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 1 as allegedly being anticipated by Mao. Claim relates to a computer-implemented method of using a paper document to retrieve multimedia information stored in a multimedia document in electronic form, wherein one or more user-selectable identifiers are printed on the paper document. The method comprises "receiving a first signal indicating selection of a first user-selectable identifier from the one or more user-selectable identifiers printed on the paper document; responsive to receiving the first signal, identifying a portion of multimedia information stored by the multimedia document corresponding to the first user-selectable identifier; and outputting the portion of the multimedia information corresponding to the first user-selectable identifier using an output device"

Mao describes a device for accessing an index table for a hardcopy document, such as a book. Instead of storing the index table as printed text at the end of the book, Mao teaches that the index table can be stored as a bar code printed in the book. The bar code allows for data compression, and therefore a voluminous index table can be stored on a small number of pages. The device obtains the index table by scanning the bar code. Alternatively, the device can obtain the index table from a computer network. In either case, once the device has obtained the index table, the index table is stored in a memory component inside the device. A user can then enter key words into the device to search for appropriate entries in the index table. The key words may be entered manually using a key pad or electronic pen. Alternatively, the key words may be entered by optically scanning the words from a page of the hardcopy document. Once the key words are entered, they are used to search for appropriate entries in the index table, and the results are displayed to the user. See Mao at col. 6, line 19 through col. 7, line 57 and Figs.

4-7.

Mao fails to disclose "multimedia information stored by the multimedia document" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner only cites search engine 410 in Figure 4 of Mao

Appl. No. 10/001,894  
Amdt. dated February 7, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of October 6, 2004

PATENT

generally, as supposedly disclosing the step of "responsive to receiving the first signal, identifying a portion of multimedia information stored by the multimedia document corresponding to the first user-selectable identifier the claimed step of disclosing this claim limitation." The Examiner does not point out what specific feature of Mao, if any, discloses "multimedia information stored by the multimedia document." In Figure 4 of Mao, it appears that search engine 410 searches through the index table 420 stored in memory 412. See Mao at col. 7, lines 5-49, and Fig. 4. Thus, as best as applicants can tell, the Examiner's position may be that the index table 420 stored in memory 412 searched by search engine 410 is comparable to the "multimedia information stored by the multimedia document" as recited in claim 1.

However, the index table 420 stored in memory 412 of Mao is merely a table of words selected from a hardcopy document, such as a book. By contrast, "multimedia information" as recited in claim 1 refers to "information that comprises information of several different types in an integrated form. The different types of information included in multimedia information may include a combination of text information, graphics information, animation information, sound (audio) information, video information, and the like." Present application at page 2, paragraph 10. Clearly, the simple index table of a hardcopy document, as disclosed by Mao, is not "multimedia information stored by the multimedia document" as recited in claim 1. Indeed, the Examiner does not point to any feature in Mao that is even remotely suggestive of "multimedia information stored by the multimedia document." As such, Mao does not disclose or make obvious the step of "responsive to receiving the first signal, identifying a portion of multimedia information stored by the multimedia document corresponding to the first user-selectable identifier," as recited in claim 1.

Thus, it is believed that Mao fails to anticipate or make obvious the invention as recited in claim 1.

Claims 8, 17, 24, and 37

Independent claims 8, 17, 24, and 37 are rejected under § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by Mao, based on the same rationale as cited against claim 1. For at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that Mao also does not disclose or make obvious claims 8, 17, 24, and 37.

Appl. No. 10/001,894  
Amdt. dated February 7, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of October 6, 2004

PATENT

Claims 4, 7, 9, 20, 23, 25, 33, 36, and 38

Claims 4 and 7 depend from claim 1. Claim 9 depends from claim 8. Claims 20 and 23 depend from claim 17. Claim 25 depend from claim 24. Claim 38 depends from claim 37. Each of claims 4, 7, 9, 20, 23, 25, 33, 36, and 38 includes all of the limitations of its respective independent claim. As such, applicants respectfully submit that Mao also does not disclose or make obvious claims 4, 7, 9, 20, 23, 25, 33, 36, and 38, for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claims 8, 17, 24, and 37.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 13, 15, 29, 31, 42, and 44

Independent claims 13, 15, 29, 31, 42, and 44 are rejected under § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable, based in part on the same disclosure of Mao and rationale as cited against claim 1. For at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 13, 15, 29, 31, 42, and 44 are patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 10-12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 26-28, 32, 34, 35, 39-41, 43, 45

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 depend from claim 1. Claims 10-12 depend from claim 8. Claim 14 depends from claim 13. Claim 16 depends from claim 15. Claim 18, 19, 21, and 22 depend from claim 17. Claims 26-28 depend from claim 24. Claim 30 depends from claim 29. Claims 32, 34, and 35 depend from claim 31. Claims 39-41 depend from claim 37. Claim 43 depends from claim 42. Claim 45 depends from claim 44. Each of claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 10-12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 26-28, 32, 34, 35, 39-41, 43, 45 includes all of the limitations of its respective independent claim. As such, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 10-12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 26-28, 32, 34, 35, 39-41, 43, 45 are patentable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claims 1, 8, 13, 15, 17, 24, 29, 31, 37, 42, and 44.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/001,894  
Amdt. dated February 7, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of October 6, 2004

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Ko-Fang Chang  
Reg. No. 50,829

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400 / Fax: 415-576-0300  
KC/djb  
60332382 v1